

G. Patrick Stahly, Ph.D. pstahly@tricliniclabs.com www.tricliniclabs.com



#### LF Raman Spectroscopy + other stuff

This presentation describes a system of isoenergetic polymorphs (polymorphs that are "virtually indistinguishable except by means of X-ray diffraction")<sup>1</sup>. Reported are analytical data from multiple techniques, quantitative XRPD method development, and the use of low-frequency (LF) Raman spectroscopy for both qualitative and quantitative analyses.

1. Carstensen, J. T.; Franchini, M. K. Drug Dev. Ind. Pharm. 1995, 21, 523-536



- An API that exists as two, isoenergetic anhydrates.
- Polymorph **2** contains several free-standing peaks in its XRPD pattern that are not in the pattern of polymorph **1** (arrows).
- The reverse is not true.
  - Difficult to distinguish pure **2** from mixtures of **1** and **2**.





#### Vibrational Spectroscopy





DSC and TG





- The API was formulated as an aqueous slurry using micronized **1**.
- Over time, solids suspended in formulation vehicle changed appearance from featureless particles to plates and needles.



freshly-micronized API in DP DP after 3 months at 5 C

- Questions
  - What is happening?
  - How to generate a stable drug product?
- Analytical methods are needed that differentiate **1** and **2**.





obtained from a slurry of micronized API in an aqueous formulation vehicle at 40 °C



#### **Crystal Structures**

#### Polymorph 1

Polymorph 2



	Polymorph 1	Polymorph <b>2</b>
crystal habit	plate	needle
crystal system, space group	monoclinic, <i>P</i> 2 <sub>1</sub>	orthorhombic, $P2_12_12_1$
data collection temperature (K)	100	100
a (Å)	5.5022(6)	5.4710(11)
b (Å)	7.0634(6)	7.1450(14)
c (Å)	21.5819(14)	42.333(8)
α (°)	90	90
β (°)	95.621(6)	90
γ (°)	90	90
volume (Å <sup>3</sup> )	834.73(3)	1654.8(6)
Z	2	4
d <sub>calc</sub> (g cm <sup>-3</sup> )	1.513	1.527
R factor (%)	3.9	3.6



# **Crystal Structures**



small but measurable differences in the diffraction maxima from a specific set of (h,k,l) planes



- Careful examination of XRPD patterns (previous slide) suggestes they can be differenatiated by full-pattern analysis
- Triclinic routinely develops solid mixture analysis methods using XRPD
- Using XRPD for quantitative (or semiquantitative) measurements presents problems that do not occur when using liquid techniques such as HPLC
  - mixing of standards
  - preferred orientation effects
  - sample/specimen size
  - minimum balance weight
  - non-sample data
  - minor specimen offset
  - changing tube power



- Mixing of standards
  - Solids do not mix homogeneously
    - avoid sub-sampling
    - irradiate entire mixture
  - In this case it is difficult to distinguish pure **2** from mixtures of **1** and **2** 
    - how can mixtures be made containing known amounts of **1** and **2**?
- Preffered orientation effects
  - Random changes in relative peak intensities render standard plots of peak heights or areas against known concentrations useless
  - In this case XRPD patterns of polymorph 2 clearly exhibit the effects of preferred orientation





XRPD pattern of P2 is affected by preferred orientation XRPD pattern of P1 is not



- Sample/specimen size
  - The sizes of specimen holders for XRPD diffrctometers are designed so that as much as possible of the specimen is irradiated by the incoming X-rays
    - specimen holders are small in all three dimensions
    - reflection holders used at Triclinic hold between 5 and 25 mg of material, depending on density



- Minimum balance weight
  - USP chapter 41: balances must be calibrated over their operating range and meet the requirements defined for repeatability and accuracy.
    - minimum weight of most sensitive balance at Triclinic (6-place) is about 1 mg



Here is a real-world example of the effect of the combination of specimen holder size and minimum balance weight:

- Triclinic developed an XRPD method that had a detection limit of about 0.2% crystalline material in an amorphous matrix, determined based on signal-to-noise ratios
- To confirm that detection limit a mixture of 0.1% crystalline in amorphous was required
- The minimum weight requirement (1 mg of crystalline material) limited the total sample weight to no less than 1 gram
- Only 8 mg of the very fluffy mixture fit in the specimen holder
- Each XRPD measurement took 65 minutes at the optimum measurement speed (0.2 °2θ/min)
- It would take 125 specimens to analyze a single 0.1% mixture
- Data from multiple aliquots were co-added to give a final data set for each mixture
- XRPD sensitivity depends on counting (Poisson) statistics, so signal-to-noise =  $N/\sqrt{N}$
- The desired sensitivity is reached with a 65-minute scan time of a single sample. The same sensitivity can be obtained by analyzing each of the 125 aliquots for only 31 seconds each (65 min ÷ 125). Although the diffractometer time is the same no matter how many aliquots are analyzed, a larger number of aliquots means more analyst time is required to prepare specimens.



#### • Non-sample data

- X-rays reaching the detector can arise from things other than the sample
  - incoherent scattering by air (the scattered radiation is of a different wavelength than the impinging radiation)
  - Compton scattering (incoherent scattering from specimen)
  - Bremsstrahlung radiation (continuous wavelengths from the tube)
- Pre-processing XRPD data is necessary
  - collect data from an empty specimen holder and subtract it from specimen data
  - digital filtration
  - smoothing
  - normalization



- Minor specimen offset
  - Arises from specimen surface not being exactly at diffractometer focal plane
  - Requires pattern shifting to common peak position with standard
- Changing tube power
  - X-ray tubes decay with time
  - Requires setting tube intensity limits and monitoring as part of the method to insure DL is still valid
    - Attenuate tube to approximate intensity loss & test DL mixture
    - Calculate using signal-to-noise data



- Problems to overcome
  - The polymorphic purities of reference standards are unknown
  - Therefore, mixtures of known concentrations cannot be made
  - XRPD patterns from P2 are severely affected by preferred orientation
- Data collection
  - multiple spectra from samples containing mixtures of unknown concentrations
- Data Analysis
  - $_{\circ}$  smooth
  - o filter
  - $\circ$  normalize
  - pattern shift
  - principal component analysis (PCA)
  - o alternating least squares (ALS) analysis



- A 'standardless' XRPD method was developed
  - To overcome the issue with preparation of physical standards, standard XRPD patterns were identified
    - chemometric analyses starting with reference pattern from polymorph 1
    - Rietveld analyses starting with the unit cells of 1 and 2
    - principle component analysis limited to 2 components
    - widely variable numbers from the above analyses indicated that the patterns cannot be described by a simple binary system (PO effect)
    - principle component analysis limited to 3 components identified 3 reference patterns that represented all mixture data



A semi-quantitative method was developed using random-forest pattern clustering followed by alternating-least-squares analyses. That process is described as semi-quantitative because method validation was not carried out. For each measured pattern from a sample of unknown content, the best matching pattern was calculated by linear combinations of the three reference patterns. The amounts of each polymorph were then derived from the amounts of each reference pattern used. Note that the amounts of polymorph **2** were calculated by addition of the amounts of reference patterns 2 and 2(PO).



# LF Raman Spectroscopy

# Triclinic Labs acquired LF Raman capability during the isoenergetic polymorphs project



# LF Raman Equipment



ONDAX (now COHERENT) SureBlock™ ultra narrow-band notch filter

Tablet holder and probe sample interfaces





# LF Raman Spectroscopy





# **Phonon Vibrations**









full Raman spectra acquired for each polymorph





correlation between FT (1064 nm) and dispersive (853 nm) Raman spectra





differentiation of P1 and P2 note Stokes more intense than anti-Stokes









differentiation of P1, and P2, and mixture Stokes signals only



#### mixtures were made and analyzed

P <b>1</b>	P <b>2</b>
0	100
20	80
40	60
50	50
60	40
80	20
100	0

- multiple spectra were collected from each using the contact/immersion probe in contact mode
- mixtures are inhomogeneous (next slide)
- will try slurry of mixtures in inert liquid





mixture inhomogeneity, signal shifting



co-added 6 spectra per mixture direct classical least squares analysis recovery curves

						100 -	w = 2.0270 + 0.00(04x D=0.00454
						80	$y = 3.9379 \pm 0.99004x$ , R=0.99454
P1			P2	à	80 -		
ł	Known	Predicted	Known	Predicted	d 🔗		
	0	0	100	100	-	60 -	•
	20	23.58	80	76.42	۵.		
	40	44.67	60	55.33	%		
	50	60.45	50	39.55	σ	40 -	•
	60	64.9	40	35.1	ite		
	80	82.58	20	17.42	dic		
	100	100	0	0	le	20-	
					d		
						0	y = -3.5421 + 0.99604x, R=0.99454
							20 40 60 80

Triclinic Labs

Nov. 2020

actual % P1

# In-Situ Monitoring of Crystallization



# Additional LF Raman Experiments

- Solvent appears to drive polymorph: P1 from MEK, P2 from alcohols
  - Monitor in-situ crystallization from alcohols
  - Add turbidity probe and monitor crystallizations with both
- Re-run slurry interconversion experiment and monitor in-situ
  - Use data to quantify amounts of P1 and P2 throughout the process

Triclinic is routinely characterizing solid forms using LF Raman spectroscopy and considers it to be a viable technique for quantitative solid mixture analysis



Thank you for your attention

# **Questions welcome**

Triclinic Labs, Inc. 2660 Schuyler Ave., Suite A Lafayette, IN 47905 USA 765.588.6200 www.tricliniclabs.com

